IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

Breidenbach, et al.

Serial No.: 10/046,347

Filed: October 26, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2173

Examiner: Pillai, Namitha

Docket No. 10010026-1

For: **System And Method For Improving The Performance Of A Plurality Of Peripheral Devices**

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed June 20, 2007, responding to the Final Office Action mailed January 25, 2007.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees are required to consider this Appeal Brief. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

I. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no known related appeals or interferences that will affect or be affected by a decision in this Appeal.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 12-23 have been canceled leaving claims 1, 4, 6, 8-11, and 24-42 remaining. Each of those claims stand finally rejected. No claims have been allowed. The final rejections of claims 1, 4, 6, 8-11, and 24-42 are appealed.

IV. Status of Amendments

This application was originally filed on October 26, 2001, with twenty-three (23) claims. In a Response filed December 21, 2004, Applicant amended claims 1, 6-8, canceled claims 2, 12-23, and added new claims 24-42. In a Response submitted with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed July 20, 2005, Applicant amended claims 1, 11, and canceled claim 7. In a Response filed November 8, 2006, Applicant

amended claim 1. In a Response filed March 23, 2007, Applicant amended claims 1, and canceled claims 3 and 5.

All of the above-identified amendments have been entered and no other amendments have been made to any of claims 1, 4, 6, 8-11, and 24-42. The claims in the attached Claims Appendix (see below) reflect the present state of those claims.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The claimed inventions are summarized below with reference numerals and references to the written description ("specification") and drawings. The subject matter described in the following appears in the original disclosure at least where indicated, and may further appear in other places within the original disclosure.

Independent claim 1 describes a system for improving the performance of a plurality of peripheral devices. The system comprises a first peripheral device (102, 116, Fig. 1) comprising a first software component and having a first functionality. *Applicant's specification*, page 4, line 8 to page 5, line 20. The system of claim 1 further comprises a second peripheral device (104, Fig. 1) coupled to the first peripheral device via a network (110, Fig. 1), the second peripheral device comprising a second software component and having a second functionality (*Applicant's specification*, page 4, line 8 to page 5, line 20), the second peripheral device being coupled to the first peripheral device without being directly connected to an intermediate computing device positioned along the communication path between the peripheral devices (*Applicant's specification*, page 5, line 21 to page 6, line 10; page 14, lines 17-20; Figs. 1 and 4), the first and second peripheral devices together performing a third functionality in addition to the first

and second functionalities (*Applicant's specification*, page 4, line 21 to page 5, line 11). In addition, the first peripheral device comprises a peripheral device display on which can be presented a graphical user interface that presents the third functionality to a user for selection. *Applicant's specification*, page 15, line 22 to page 16, line 15.

Independent claim 24 describes a method practiced by a personal computer (PC) (202, Fig. 1) for providing additional functionality from peripheral devices. The method comprises searching for and identifying peripheral devices that are accessible to the PC. *Applicant's specification*, page 4, lines 21-24. The method of claim 24 further comprises determining the capabilities of each identified peripheral device using the PC. *Applicant's specification*, page 4, line 24 to page 5, line 2. The system of claim 24 further comprises presenting to the user with the PC a functionality that is available through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices, the functionality being a functionality that is not independently provided by the identified peripheral devices. *Applicant's specification*, page 5, lines 2-7.

Independent claim 32 describes a personal computer (PC). The PC comprises a processor (204, Fig. 2) and memory (206, Fig. 2). *Applicant's specification*, page 6, lines 20-24. The memory comprises peripheral device software (210, Fig. 2) that is configured to search for and identify peripheral devices (*Applicant's specification*, page 4, lines 21-24), to determine the capabilities of each identified peripheral device using the PC (*Applicant's specification*, page 4, line 24 to page 5, line 2), and to present to a user a functionality that is available through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices, the functionality being a functionality that is not

independently provided by the identified peripheral devices (*Applicant's specification*, page 5, lines 2-7).

Independent claim 38 describes a peripheral device (102, 104, 116; Fig. 4) that comprises auto recognition logic (410, 420, 430; Fig. 4) that is configured to transmit a broadcast message on a network to announce the presence of the peripheral device on the network. *Applicant's specification*, page 15, lines 16-19. The system of claim 38 further comprises receive response signals from compatible peripheral devices also on the network, the response signals comprising information as to the identity and capabilities of the compatible peripheral devices. *Applicant's specification*, page 15, lines 19-22. The system of claim 38 further comprises automatically present a functionality option to a user that is only available through combination of the capabilities of the peripheral device and at least one of the compatible peripheral devices. *Applicant's specification*, page 15, line 22 to page 16, line 2.

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The following grounds of rejection are to be reviewed on appeal:

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Casey, et al.* ("Casey," U.S. Pat. No. 6,452,695).

2. Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Casey* in view of a document entitled "Wireless Networks" ("the Wireless Networks document").

3. Claims 24-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Casey* in view of *Brockway et al.* ("Brockway," U.S. Pat. No. 6,789,111).

VII. Arguments

The Appellant respectfully submits that Applicant's claims are neither anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 nor obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals overturn the final rejections of those claims at least for the reasons discussed below.

A. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Casey, et al.* ("Casey," U.S. Pat. No. 6,452,695). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In the present case, not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the Casey reference.

1. The Casey Disclosure

Casey discloses a system and method for enabling an image input device 300 and a printer 200 to operate as a digital copier. *Casey*, Patent Title; column 2, lines 55-58. The system includes an "adapter device 100" that interconnects the printer 200 with the image input device 300. *Casey*, column 2, lines 55-62.

The architecture of the adapter device is disclosed in relation to Figure 2 and columns 3-5. As described by Casey, the adapter device 100 includes a central processing unit or "processor" 140, memory 130, an I/O controller 120, and a control panel 110. *Casey*, column 3, lines 13-33. The control panel 110 comprises buttons 112 and a display 114. *Casey*, column 3, lines 35-40. As stated by Casey, the adapter device is "preferably packaged such that all of the components, with the exception of the control panel 110, are contained within a housing or on a relatively compact peripheral card device". *Casey*, column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 1. Therefore, Casey's adapter device 100 comprises an independent hardware component that can be used in conjunction with a printer and an image input device.

In addition to the above-described configuration, Casey discloses that the adapter device 100 can be "integrated within a printer 200 or within an image input device 300 to enable direct connection between the peripheral devices (without the need for a host computer) thereby imparting the capability of the digital copier operation described herein." *Casey*, column 5, lines 17-21.

2. Applicant's Claims

Independent claim 1 provides as follows (emphasis added):

> 1. A system for improving the performance of a plurality of peripheral devices, comprising:
>
> a first peripheral device comprising a first software component and having a first functionality; and
>
> a second peripheral device *coupled to the first peripheral device via a network*, the second peripheral device comprising a second software

component and having a second functionality, the second peripheral device being coupled to the first peripheral device without being directly connected to an intermediate computing device positioned along the communication path between the peripheral devices, the first and second peripheral devices together performing a third functionality in addition to the first and second functionalities;

wherein the first peripheral device comprises a peripheral device display on which can presented a graphical user interface that presents the third functionality to a user for selection.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant notes that Casey does not teach first and second peripheral devices that are coupled to each other "via a network". Although Casey shows in Figure 1 a network 400 that is connected to the adapter device 100, the printer 200 and the image input device 300 communicate with each other *via the adapter device, not the network*. *See Casey*, Figure 1. Therefore, although Casey's peripheral devices may be considered to be indirectly connected to a network 400 through the adapter device 100, they certainly are not coupled *to each other* "via a network". Indeed, Casey even states that the image input device 300 and the printer 200 have a "direct connection" due to the presence of the adapter device 100. *Casey*, column 5, lines 16-21.

In the Response to Arguments section of the final Office Action, the Examiner stated that "both peripheral devices are linked to a network and therefore are connected to each other and the network." *Final Office Action*, page 11. In reply, Applicant notes that the fact that Casey shows each of the peripheral devices (i.e., image input device 300 and printer 200) connected to a network through the adapted device 100 does not mean that the two devices are connected to each other *via* the network. Indeed, it is clear from Figure 1 that the image input device 300 and the printer 200 are not

connected to each other via a network. Instead, only the adapter device 100 separates the image input device 300 and the printer 200. *See Casey*, Figure 1. For at least that reason, Casey does not teach "each and every" limitation of independent claim 1.

In regard to the Examiner's comment in the Advisory Action that "a distinct path can be followed to show that every component within Figure 1 is connected to each other," Applicant agrees. However, that does not change the simple fact that Casey's image input device 300 and printer 200 are not connected to each other *via* the network 400. Again, this is exceedingly clear from Casey's Figure 1. In regard to the Examiner's comment that Applicant argues that "the peripheral devices are not directly connected to the network," Applicant notes that Applicant has not made that argument. Instead, Applicant has merely identified that the connection between Casey's image input device 300 and the printer 200 is not by way of the network 400.

As a final point regarding claim 1, Applicant notes that the distinction between two peripheral devices being coupled via a network and the arrangement shown in Casey's Figure 1 is significant. For example, if two peripheral devices are coupled "via a network" as recited in Applicant's claim 1, the devices inherently are configured for network communications. Such functionality is not, however, required of Casey's image input device 300 and printer 200 given that those components need only communicate via the adapter device 100. Applicant further notes that Casey does not disclose that either the image input device 300 or the printer 200 is configured to send and/or receive data via a network. Moreover, network communication functionality in the image input device 300 and/or the printer 200 is not inherent because such functionality is not necessary in Casey's system. As described by the Federal Circuit:

> Inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient to establish inherency. *See Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 1269, 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra, L.L.C., 178 F.3d 1378, 51 USPQ2d 1055 (Fed. Cir. 1999), Revising, 156 F.3d 1193, 48 USPQ2d 1037 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Furthermore, the Federal Circuit has noted:

> [A] prior art reference may anticipate without disclosing a feature of the claimed invention if that characteristic is *necessarily present*, or inherent, in the single anticipating reference.

Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharm., Inc., 339 F.3d 1373, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (emphasis added). In the present case, network communication functionality is not "necessarily present" in Casey's image input device 300 and printer 200 given that the adapter device 100 handles all communications, both with the network 400 and the image input device 300 and the printer 200. In other words, Casey's disclosed system operates fine even when the image input device 300 and printer 200 cannot communicate over a network.

Turning to dependent claim 8, Casey further does not teach software components of first and second peripheral devices that "exchange" information pertaining to their identifier over a network. In regard to the Examiner's comment in the Response to Arguments section of the final Office Action regarding accessing "software information"

from the network 400, Applicant notes that Casey only describes the adapter device 100 receiving software from the network 400, and then providing it to the printer 200 using a "PCI controller 128." *Casey*, column 3, lines 52-54. Such an arrangement does not equate to Casey's image input device 300 and printer 200 exchanging information with each other over a network. Indeed, it is clear that the image input device 300 and printer 200 exchange no information with each other than the image data collected by the image input device that is to be printed to the printer.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Casey further does not teach that the information exchanged between the first and second peripheral devices comprises "information relating to the capabilities of the first peripheral device and the second peripheral device". Again, Casey's image input device 300 and printer 200 exchange no information with each other, other than image data to be printed. Regarding column 5, lines 61-67 and column 6, lines 1-6 of the Casey reference, which were relied upon by the Examiner in the final Office Action, although Casey describes "data structures" of the adapter device 100 that store the operating parameters of the printer 200, nowhere does Casey state that those operating parameters are "exchanged" between the printer 200 and the image input device 300.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Casey also fails to teach "wherein the first peripheral device modifies its capabilities based on the information received from the second peripheral device". Again, no information from Casey's image input device 300 is "received" by Casey's printer 200 or vice versa.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Casey does not teach "wherein the first peripheral device presents to a user with the graphical user interface a menu of

available functionality based on the information received from the second peripheral device". Again, no information from Casey's image input device 300 is "received" by Casey's printer 200 or vice versa.

B. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As has been acknowledged by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") has the burden under section 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or generally available knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art that would lead that individual to the claimed invention. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) section 2143 discusses the requirements of a *prima facie* case for obviousness. That section provides as follows:

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure.

1. Rejection of Claim 4

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Casey* in view of a document entitled "Wireless Networks" ("the Wireless Networks document"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As is identified above, Casey fails to disclose explicit limitations of Applicant's claim 1. In that the Wireless Networks document does not remedy the deficiencies of the Casey reference, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable over Casey. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

As a further matter, Applicant reiterates that Casey's image input device 300 and printer 200 are not "coupled" (i.e., connected to each other) via a network. In view of that fact, and further in view of the fact that Casey's adapter device 100 comprises network capabilities and therefore can retrieve software at least for the printer 200 via the network 400, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not through common sense think to add wireless network capability to the image input device 300 and printer 200. In particular, such capability is unnecessary in Casey's system due to the presence of the adapter device 100 and the addition of such capability would significantly increase the cost of both the image input device 300 and the printer 200.

2. Rejection of Claims 24-42

Claims 24-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Casey* in view of *Brockway et al.* ("Brockway," U.S. Pat. No. 6,789,111). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

a. Claims 24-42

Independent claims 24 and 32 provide as follows (emphasis added):

> 24. A method *practiced by a personal computer (PC)* for providing additional functionality from peripheral devices, the method comprising:
>
> *searching for and identifying peripheral devices that are accessible to the PC*;
>
> *determining the capabilities of each identified peripheral device using the PC*; and
>
> presenting to the user with the PC a functionality that is available through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices, the functionality being a functionality that is not independently provided by the identified peripheral devices.

> 32. A *personal computer (PC)*, comprising:
>
> a processor; and
>
> memory comprising peripheral device software that is configured to *search for and identify peripheral devices*, to *determine the capabilities of each identified peripheral device* using the PC, and to present to a user a functionality that is available through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices, the functionality being a functionality that is not independently provided by the identified peripheral devices.

In regard to claims 24 and 32, the Examiner first argues that Casey discloses a "personal computer" that provides an additional functionality for peripheral devices. Applicant disagrees. Specifically, Casey never says that his "adapter device 100" comprises a "personal computer". Indeed, Casey actually explicitly *teaches away* from a

personal computer by describing the adapter device 100 as a "relatively compact peripheral card device" in column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 1, and by expressing the desirability of *not* having to use a host computer in column 5, lines 17-21 where Casey states that the adapter device 100 enables "direct connection" of the image input device 300 and the printer 200 "without the need for a host computer."

In the Response to Arguments section of the final Office Action, the Examiner states that the adapter device 100 actually is a personal computer (PC) because it comprises a processor and memory. *Final Office Action*, page 11. In reply, Applicant submits that such an interpretation is both unreasonable and unwarranted. In particular, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not consider Casey's "adapter device 100" as comprising a "PC" given that PCs are widely understood to be workstations or other "desktop" type computers, not peripheral card devices. Furthermore, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not consider Casey's adapter device 100 as comprising a "PC" given that Casey states that the adapter device 100 could be *integrated into* the image input device 300 or printer 200. *Casey*, column 5, lines 16-21. Clearly, a PC could not realistically be *integrated into* such devices.

The Examiner also argues that it would have been obvious to modify Casey's system to enable "searching for and identifying peripheral devices that are accessible to the PC" and "determining the capabilities of each identified peripheral device using the PC" in view of the Brockway reference. Applicant disagrees. Although Brockway discloses automatic detection of peripheral devices with a computer for the purpose of installing driver software for the devices, Casey's adapter device 100, which again is described at one point as being implemented as a "compact peripheral card device," is hardly

equivalent to a computer. A person having ordinary skill in the art would not think to provide the detection functionality of Brockway's computer on Casey's adapter device. Furthermore, as noted above, Casey teaches away from the need of a computer.

Moreover, Applicant notes that, contrary to that argued by the Examiner, Brockway does not disclose "determining the capabilities of each identified peripheral device". Specifically, column 2, lines 16-24 of the Brockway reference, which were relied upon by the Examiner, say nothing of determining peripheral device "capabilities." Instead, Brockway's computer merely identifies the "manufacturer and model number" of the peripheral device to enable selection of an appropriate driver. *Brockway*, column 6, lines 4-12. Therefore, there is no need in Brockway's system to determine the capabilities of the peripheral device because that information is simply not necessary to selecting a driver for the peripheral device.

In the Response to Arguments section of the final Office Action, the Examiner further alleges that "Brockway discloses determining the capabilities of a peripheral device, which includes determining the appropriate driver that is capable of being used with the peripheral device." *Final Office Action*, pages 11 and 12. In reply, Applicant notes that the Examiner merely *presumes* that Brockway's system determines the capabilities of the peripheral device in selecting a driver and cites no portion of the Brockway reference for support. In reality, Brockway provides no disclosure of determining the capabilities of a peripheral device. Applicant further notes that one cannot assume that a capability determination is made given that the "appropriate drivers" are selected simply based on the peripheral device make and model.

As a further point, Applicant notes that Brockway's alleged teaching of "determining the capabilities" of a peripheral device for the purpose of selecting a driver does not provide a suggestion to "determine the capabilities" of peripheral devices for the purpose of combining those capabilities as taught by Casey. Therefore, there is no legitimate reason for incorporating Brockway's alleged capability determination functionality into the Casey system.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 24 and 32, and their dependents, are allowable over Casey/Brockway. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection as to claims 24-37 be overturned.

With particular regard to dependent claims 30 and 36, the references do not render obvious displaying "the complete set of tasks that can be performed through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices". Applicant notes that column 3, lines 34-39 of the Casey reference, which were relied upon by the Examiner, only describe displaying buttons for operating the image input device 300 and the printer 200. Casey says nothing about displaying "the complete set of tasks" that can be performed as a result of "combination of the capabilities" of the image input device 300 and the printer 200.

b. Claims 38-42

Independent claim 38 provides as follows (emphasis added):

38. A *peripheral device*, comprising:
auto recognition logic that is configured to:
transmit a broadcast message on a network to announce the presence of the peripheral device on the network,

receive response signals from compatible peripheral devices also on the network, the response signals comprising information as to the identity and capabilities of the compatible peripheral devices, and

automatically present a functionality option to a user that is only available through combination of the capabilities of the peripheral device and at least one of the compatible peripheral devices.

Regarding claim 38, the Examiner first argues that Casey discloses "a peripheral device" with capabilities to present a functionality option to a user that is only available through combination of the capabilities of the peripheral device and another peripheral device. Applicant disagrees. Again, Casey only discloses an "adapter device 100", not a peripheral device. Furthermore, Applicant does not understand how the Examiner can reasonably identify the adapter device 100 as comprising a "PC" at one point and later identify the adapter device 100 as comprising a "peripheral device." As is well known to persons having ordinary skill in the art, peripheral devices are devices used *in conjunction with* a PC, hence the term "peripheral." Therefore, PCs and peripheral devices are clearly distinct types of computer equipment.

Second, the Examiner argues that Brockway discloses receiving response signals from compatible peripheral devices on a network that comprise information as to the identity and "capabilities of the compatible peripheral devices". As described above, Brockway says nothing about obtaining information as to the "capabilities" of a peripheral device. Moreover, Brockway does not disclose that such obtaining could be performed by a "peripheral device". Again, in Brockway's system, all information collected from peripheral devices is collected by a computer, not another peripheral device.

Applicant further notes that neither reference discloses a "peripheral device" that can "automatically present a functionality option to a user that is only available through combination of the capabilities of the peripheral device and at least one of the compatible peripheral devices". Again, it is Casey's adapter device 100 that presents functionality options to a user, not Casey's peripheral devices.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 38, and its dependents, are allowable over Casey, and respectfully requests the rejection as to claims 38-42 be withdrawn.

VIII. Conclusion

In summary, it is Applicant's position that Applicant's claims are patentable over the applied prior art references and that the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Appellant therefore respectfully requests that the Board of Appeals overturn the Examiner's rejection and allow Applicant's pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
David R. Risley
Registration No. 39,345

Claims Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii)

The following are the claims that are involved in this Appeal.

1. A system for improving the performance of a plurality of peripheral devices, comprising:

a first peripheral device comprising a first software component and having a first functionality; and

a second peripheral device coupled to the first peripheral device via a network, the second peripheral device comprising a second software component and having a second functionality, the second peripheral device being coupled to the first peripheral device without being directly connected to an intermediate computing device positioned along the communication path between the peripheral devices, the first and second peripheral devices together performing a third functionality in addition to the first and second functionalities;

wherein the first peripheral device comprises a peripheral device display on which can be presented a graphical user interface that presents the third functionality to a user for selection.

2-3. (Canceled)

4. The system of claim 1, wherein the first and second peripheral devices are coupled via a wireless network.

5. (Canceled)

6. The system of claim 1, wherein the first peripheral device is a scanner and the second peripheral device is a printer and the third functionality is a copying functionality.

7. (Canceled)

8. The system of claim 1, wherein the first software component of the first peripheral device and the second software component of the second peripheral device allow the first and second peripheral devices to exchange information over a network pertaining to the identity of the first peripheral device and the second peripheral device.

9. The system of claim 8, wherein the information exchanged between the first and second peripheral devices further comprises information relating to the capabilities of the first peripheral device and the second peripheral device.

10. The system of claim 9, wherein the first peripheral device modifies its capabilities based on the information received from the second peripheral device.

11. The system of claim 9, wherein the first peripheral device presents to a user with the graphical user interface a menu of available functionality based on the information received from the second peripheral device.

12-23. (Canceled)

24. A method practiced by a personal computer (PC) for providing additional functionality from peripheral devices, the method comprising:

searching for and identifying peripheral devices that are accessible to the PC;

determining the capabilities of each identified peripheral device using the PC; and

presenting to the user with the PC a functionality that is available through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices, the functionality being a functionality that is not independently provided by the identified peripheral devices.

25. The method of claim 24, wherein determining the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices comprises automatically querying all peripheral devices on a network to which the PC is connected.

26. The method of claim 25, wherein determining the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices further comprises receiving information from peripheral device software provided on each identified peripheral device.

27. The method of claim 24, further comprising storing information about the peripheral device capabilities in a registry of the PC.

28. The method of claim 24, wherein presenting a functionality to the user comprises presenting the functionality to the user with a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display associated with the PC.

29. The method of claim 28, wherein the GUI comprises a pull-down menu.

30. The method of claim 28, wherein the GUI displays the complete set of tasks that can be performed through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices.

31. The method of claim 24, wherein presenting a functionality to the user comprises presenting a copying functionality that is available due to a scanning capability of a scanner and a printing capability of a printer.

32. A personal computer (PC), comprising:

a processor; and

memory comprising peripheral device software that is configured to search for and identify peripheral devices, to determine the capabilities of each identified peripheral device using the PC, and to present to a user a functionality that is available through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices, the functionality being a functionality that is not independently provided by the identified peripheral devices.

33. The PC of claim 32, wherein the peripheral device software is configured to automatically query all peripheral devices on a network to which the PC is connected.

34. The PC of claim 32, wherein the peripheral device software is configured to store information about the peripheral device capabilities in a registry of the PC.

35. The PC of claim 32, wherein the peripheral device software is configured to present the functionality to the user with a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display associated with the PC.

36. The PC of claim 35, wherein the GUI displays the complete set of tasks that can be performed through combination of the capabilities of the identified peripheral devices.

37. The PC of claim 32, wherein the peripheral device software is configured to present a copying functionality that is available due to a scanning capability of a scanner and a printing capability of a printer.

38. A peripheral device, comprising:

auto recognition logic that is configured to:

transmit a broadcast message on a network to announce the presence of the peripheral device on the network,

receive response signals from compatible peripheral devices also on the network, the response signals comprising information as to the identity and capabilities of the compatible peripheral devices, and

automatically present a functionality option to a user that is only available through combination of the capabilities of the peripheral device and at least one of the compatible peripheral devices.

39. The peripheral device of claim 38, wherein the auto-recognition logic comprises a software component that is configured to modify a capability of the peripheral device based upon the information received from the compatible peripheral devices.

40. The peripheral device of claim 38, wherein the auto-recognition logic presents the functionality option to the user in a graphical user interface (GUI) of the peripheral device.

41. The peripheral device of claim 38, wherein the peripheral device is a scanner and the functionality is a copying functionality.

42. The peripheral device of claim 38, wherein the peripheral device is a digital camera and the functionality is image printing.

Evidence Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix)

There is no extrinsic evidence to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no evidence is presented in this Appendix.

Related Proceedings Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x)

There are no related proceedings to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no such proceedings are identified in this Appendix.